



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

turning it over to five men, would be un-American because it would endanger, if not destroy, what America has accomplished in the direction of popular control. The tragedy of that would be the multiplication of international resentments, the increase of ill-will, and, in consequence, additional dangers of war.

CERTAIN CRITERIA OF AN INEFFECTIVE INTERNATIONAL PEACE

AN EFFECTIVE international peace must mean order and justice between States. Such a condition can only evolve out of legislative and judicial action to the end that rights observed between men shall be stated, understood, and preserved by agreement between nations. To abolish international killings we must aim, therefore, at the abolition of war by removing the causes which produce it. An effective international peace movement presents a problem in international sanitation. The war fever will be overcome effectively in proportion as we destroy the infection at its source. Any effective association of the nations looking toward the eradication of this foul disease must concern itself, therefore, with the origins of war.

In estimating the value of remedies proposed as an amelioration of this plague, therefore, we may ask ourselves: Does the remedy propose a partnership of rulers merely? Does the proposed remedy tend to increase prejudice and destroy sympathy between nations? Will it lead to chauvinism—that is to say, false patriotism—with its destructive national greed for concessions, markets, territory? Will it perpetuate personal and political inertia? Will it unduly extend or unduly limit those attributes of the State classified as sovereignty? Will it either ignore or overemphasize the importance of precedents? Will it recognize war as a lawful method for the settlement of international disputes? Will it poison the springs of democracy by granting unlimited power to the few? In questions involving peace or war does it close the door upon the great mass of the common people? Does it base international adjustments wholly upon financial interests or thirst for power and dominion? Is it founded on the theory that the peace of the nations can be attained only by some form of military protection from without? Will it interfere threateningly with internal policies of States? Will it restrict legitimate trade or unduly limit the freedom of essential enterprise in business? Will it perpetuate or extend the inequality of nations? Will it increase the handicaps of the poor by increasing the power of the rich? Does it provide either for a system of double citizenship or non-citizenship? Does it ignore the rights of foreigners sojourning in a land? Does it leave out of consideration the

regulations necessary for the peaceable development of international waterways and shipping control? Does it forbid the right of seaports to any nation? Does it contemplate uniting in one power the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of international government? Is it based upon the theory that the only way to maintain the peace between nations is by military force? Will it unjustly deprive any nation or group of its inalienable right to exist, to be free, to seek its legitimate satisfactions? Will it abrogate the fundamental principle that just powers are derived only from the consent of the governed? Will it endanger the safety, independence, equality, or happiness of any law-abiding people? Will it do violence to the well-established solidarity of the society of nations?

Any attempt to remove by such means the causes of wholesale human slaughters must prove to be more futile than letting down empty buckets into empty wells, for it cannot lessen—it can only engender—the strifes that lead inevitably to war.

NEEDED: A LEAGUE OF LAWS AND NOT OF MEN

A MOST serious difficulty with the League of Nations as proposed by the Covenant drawn in Paris is that it aims to set up a government by men rather than a government by law. This defect appears to be fundamental, and if it is not rectified it may mean either the end forever of this style of a league or become a dangerous international threat against the most cherished principles and achievements of political democracy, including American political democracy. If the latter, it would be most unfortunate for the peace of the world, because the greatest service America can render to the well-being of the nations is to preserve her political democracy. The great contribution of America as a world power is only incidentally her foods, munitions, armaments, and men. These have been forthcoming because of a greater something, a thing deeply imbedded in our national structure, a belief, faith, love, energy, which, for the want of a more definitive word, we call democracy.

Does the proposed League of Nations threaten this our democracy? If it does not, we fear that it may. We fear this because the words "international law" occur in the Covenant three times only, once in the general affirmations of the preamble, once in Article XV where the reference is to matters outside the League, and again in Article XIII, where questions of international law are classified among those disputes suitable for submission not to a court of justice, not even to the Assembly or Council of the proposed League, but to arbitration;